Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

the fatal facility with which the student is able to read the text, it is made the occasion of a course in Anglo-Saxon equivalents, and Sanskrit "roots," of both of which the student has no direct knowledge; this is done to make the subject "hard" and disciplinary, and is called "scientific English." By such a method no correct knowledge of the language, as in itself an object of study, can be imparted, and the artistic sense in literary judgment is left undeveloped, or is, perhaps, permanently impaired.

This paper was favorably commented on by Prof. F. A. March, of Lafayette College, Pa., after which Prof. H. C. G. Brandt, of Hamilton College, New York, presented a communication:—

6. "On the Embodiment of the latest Results of Research in Text Books, and the Necessity of a Scientific Basis for Instruction."

There is a prejudice against the study of Modern Languages, and in favor of that of the Ancient Languages. Compare Modern and Ancient History. "*Das Jahr übt eine heiligende Kraft.*" "Philology" in Germany and England means Classical Philology, at least in the eyes of the classical philologians. Also, in other quarters, the philology of living languages is denied the rank and dignity of a science, hardly worthy of serious pursuit by student and investigator. German and French can be picked up anywhere, and at any time, while the student is devoting himself to the more serious and difficult studies of Mathematics, Greek, Latin, Natural Science, and Philosophy.

The traveller abroad, the merchant, the professional man, and the student in other departments of knowledge take the utilitarian view of our department, and care not how they learn French or German, scientifically or otherwise. Even Instructors in Modern Languages do not realize that their department is a science. They satisfy the utilitarian demands by some method or other.

But admitting that our department labors under serious disadvantages, we need not stop to prove that we have a science, to any one who knows what valuable contributions to the Science of Language have been made in the field of modern philology, by such men as Grimm, Scherer, ten Brink, Sievers, Paul, Braune, Sweet, Skeat, Kluge, to mention only "*Germanisten.*" Sievers' and Sweet's work in Phonetics, and Paul's *Principien der Sprachgeschichte*, were instanced.

Our department having a science, we must insist upon it that all teaching should start from a strictly scientific basis, and all the aids in teaching, text-books, reference books, etc., should be constructed upon such a basis. Why?

1. Our department and our profession gain weight and dignity. While the methods of the Classical teacher are accused of being too conservative, narrow, and stale, ours are as justly accused of being too loose and easy, unscientific, and unsystematic. Strict methods and a scientific groundwork, require teachers specially and scientifically trained for their profession. The impression is, anybody can teach French and German. The native teacher needs more preparation for his work than the mere circumstance of his birth in Germany and France. The American teacher's only qualification, too often, is travel or residence abroad, with very loose academic connections at best.

2. A scientific basis is the only correct one for students who will enter the higher elective work of the College and of the University; nor will it make the acquisition of the laguage necessarily more difficult for the beginner.

3. A scientific basis affords a valuable mental discipline, not otherwise attained from the study of a living language. Modern Languages have not yet had a full opportunity to show their value as disciplinary studies in courses similar to the classical courses in point of time and severity of work. They have been treated as accomplishments like dancing and music. A thorough course in German should mean an intelligent acquisition of its sounds, the writing and speaking of the language, the reading of masterpieces of German literature, syntactical drill in the reading of Lessing's difficult prose works, and *Nathan der Weise*, of the more difficult passages of *Faust* and *Wallenstein*, drill in the application of the various phonetic laws, such as *Ablaut*, *Umlaut*, Grimm's and Verner's Laws, including the comparison of "cognates."

In fact, two kinds of discipline are peculiar to the study of a living language, viz:—

1. That resulting from an exact analysis and reproduction of foreign sounds. The sounds of a *dead* language have not yet been reconstructed with that certainty required for serving such a purpose.

2. That gained from the mastery of the language of a people still living, progressing, and producing literature of the highest and noblest kind. We can so enter into the spirit of a living language as to make it, as far as such a thing is possible at all, a second mother-tongue. Such a mastery of a dead language is unattainable.

Now, if we would give our instruction a scientific basis, we must make use of the latest scientific results. The only question is, how far?

The greater danger lies in an ultra conservatism. It is far easier to shake our heads at new theories and new facts, than to keep abreast of the latest research, sift and digest its results, and present them to our advanced students. I do not mean University students and specialists merely, I mean even College students in the higher elective

classes. They must study the phonetic laws whose invaribility is being more and more established.

Compare, for instance, in German, Grassmann's and Verner's explanation of the two large groups of apparent exceptions to Grimm's Law. Even the beginner can acquire the strong verbs just as well arranged in classes corresponding to the now well established ablaut-series as in the old, hap-hazard arrangement. He will have nothing to unlearn as he advances. Pronunciation should be studied according to the Bell-Sweet principle of analysis and synthesis of sounds.

Prof. March remarked at the close of this paper that truth should be held up to the student, rather than the latest theory, or the most modern publication.

Prof. Elliott thought that, for advanced students especially, the presentation of an historical survey of theories, even though some of them had been recognized as false, would often prove of great benefit; that frequently through the incorrect ideas of writers the teacher might forcibly illustrate sound doctrine on a given subject. The trained pupil should not only be taught truth, but taught how to sift falsehood from truth.

Prof. Kroeh, of the Stevens Institute, referring to the second part of Prof. Brandt's subject, stated it as his conviction that the leading principles of Phonetics should constitute the basis and primary object of instruction in the Modern Languages. For practical teaching, the importance of a clear appreciation of the elementary sounds of a language cannot be valued too highly.

7. The next communication, "What Place has Old English Philology in our Elementary Schools?" was by Dr. Francis B. Gummere, of the Swain Free School, New Bedford, Mass., and, in the absence of the author, was read by Prof. C. E. Hart, of Rutgers College, N. J.

English Philology is in a flourishing condition as regards our American Colleges and Universities. But elementary English instruction has not as yet profited by this state of things. Both the teacher and the taught in our lowest grades of public instruction should be put in line with the movement towards a sound and scientific system of English philology in our best colleges. At present it is as if the great observatories should accept the Copernican system of Astronomy, while elementary text-books still taught the Ptolemaic. Different standards are set up. The "Schoolmaster" is regarded as a teacher who may, or may not, be a scholar; the college professor as